

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MAMOUN AHMED,

No. 4:20-CV-02318

Petitioner,

(Judge Brann)

v.

(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

WARDEN CLAIR DOLL,

Respondent.

ORDER

APRIL 23, 2021

Mamoun Ahmed, an individual detained by the United States Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging his continued detention in light of its duration, as well as the COVID-19 pandemic.¹ On March 31, 2021, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court deny and dismiss without prejudice Ahmed's petition, as Ahmed failed to demonstrate that his detention without a bond hearing was unduly lengthy, and failed to demonstrate any deliberate indifference on the part of prison officials, or unconstitutional conditions of confinement.² No timely objections were filed to this Report and Recommendation.

¹ Doc. 1.

² Doc. 12.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁴ After reviewing the record, the Court finds no error—clear or otherwise—in Magistrate Judge Arbuckle’s conclusion that Ahmed is not entitled to relief at this time.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 12), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Ahmed’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition (Doc. 1) is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED** without prejudice;
3. To the extent that one is required, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability;⁵ and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
United States District Judge

³ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

⁵ *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (setting forth legal standard).